

LWG COMMENTS ON EPA'S FEASIBILITY STUDY DRAFT SECTION 1 TEXT

This document contains the Lower Willamette Group's (LWG) comments on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) draft revised Feasibility Study (FS) Section 1. EPA provided a draft of Section 1 of the revised FS to the LWG on July 8, 2014. EPA extended the standard 30-day FS section review and resolution process deadline for this section to August 29, 2014, to allow for a coordinated LWG review of EPA's revised draft of Section 5 and Section 10 of the Remedial Investigation (RI), which contain information relevant to the FS. The LWG encourages EPA to consider and incorporate these comments in preparing its formal letter directing the LWG to incorporate its final revisions to FS Section 1.

In general, the LWG has significant concerns with EPA's stated intention to "streamline" the FS because the deleted information discussed below provides necessary support, both scientific and legal, for EPA's remedy selection. Removal of the content is contrary to EPA guidance and practice. *See, e.g.*, Lower Duwamish River Feasibility Study Sections 2.1 (Environmental Setting), Section 2.3 (Conceptual Site Model), and Section 2.4 (Source Control Strategy).

With these comments, we are providing a marked copy of Section 1 identifying areas of remaining disagreement as well as memorializing agreements the LWG was able to reach with EPA during the review period.

1 – DELETION OF CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL

Although EPA retained some references to a few conceptual site model (CSM) fate and transport processes, the bulk of the Draft FS CSM description was removed. Critical CSM information for FS alternative development and evaluation that was removed includes:

- 1) Physical factors and processes (e.g., descriptions of bathymetry, deposition/erosion, debris, substrate types, and shoreline conditions)
- 2) Site uses (e.g., channel and maintenance dredging areas)
- 3) Human activities (e.g., vessel traffic patterns, propwash, and historical remediation)
- 4) Chemical distributions (e.g., subsurface contamination figures, biota tissue chemical concentrations, transition zone water [TZW] concentrations)
- 5) Biological habitats and restoration sites
- 6) Site sources (e.g., details in Appendix Q)
- 7) Potential risks (e.g., summaries of certain scenarios and receptors are missing)
- 8) A thorough presentation and discussion of fate and transport processes.

EPA's CSM focuses on a schematic from the 2012 Draft FS, which is insufficient to convey the existence and interplay of these various CSM factors (as compared to the detailed CSM maps in 2012 Draft FS Figure 2.6-2, which were deleted). In addition, EPA's CSM discussion does not refer the reader to the location of this information either in the RI, later in the FS, or someplace else. Indeed, some specific components of the CSM, such as the extent of in-water debris, vessel

DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE

This document is currently under review by EPA and its federal, state, and tribal partners, and is subject to change in whole or in part.

traffic patterns, prop wash, historical remediation, habitat restoration sites, updated source information and fate and transport modeling are considered in the FS CSM but not presented in the RI.

The inclusion in the FS of the CSM information noted above and identified in the LWG's detailed comments in Section 1 is absolutely necessary to provide a foundation and rationale for many later discussions in the FS and ultimately for the evaluation and selection of a remedial alternative. A few obvious examples of their necessity include the following:

- 1) Descriptions of bathymetry and deposition/erosion are needed to understand how potential remedial technologies might apply to various areas of the Study Area.
- 2) Identification of site uses as they relate to navigation is critical to explaining why dredging versus in situ technologies may be more prudent in particular areas.
- 3) Identification of current and potential future human activities similarly is critical to evaluating remedial technologies, such as dredging and capping.
- 4) An understanding of subsurface contaminant concentrations (at an FS-level of detail) is essential to defining volumes for alternatives, because concentrations in tissue relate to bioaccumulation risks that the alternatives need to indirectly address, and concentrations in TZW relate to the potential effectiveness of capping.
- 5) Biological habitat information is critical to assessing the potential habitat impacts of each alternative and the potential need for mitigation. EPA specifically instructed the LWG to include consideration of habitat in the 2012 Draft FS.
- 6) Details of site sources are needed to understand the relationship between in-water alternatives in each sediment management area and potential ongoing upland sources that, if not controlled, could recontaminate sediment.
- 7) A full understanding of potential risks identified in the baseline risk assessments is needed in order to ensure that alternatives are developed and evaluated with regard to reduction of those potential risks.
- 8) A thorough understanding of fate and transport processes supports FS discussions of source impacts, recontamination, monitored natural recovery (MNR) and enhanced monitored natural recovery (EMNR) effectiveness, capping effectiveness, dredge releases, and remedy effects on bioaccumulation risks.

EPA has indicated during FS Section 1 discussions that many of these factors will be discussed later in the FS where these issues arise. EPA has not provided any indication as to where or how it intends to relocate this information, so it is difficult for the LWG to assess whether these issues will be adequately addressed.

Finally, the deletion of most CSM components from the FS is especially problematic given that EPA has also removed most of the CSM from the RI, leaving the RI/FS as a whole without a functional conceptual site model. EPA's sediment guidance is clear that all of the elements of the CSM discussed previously must be understood to support the FS. (EPA 2005) Specifically, the sediment guidance provides a detailed description of the CSM elements necessary to support

DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE

This document is currently under review by EPA and its federal, state, and tribal partners, and is subject to change in whole or in part.

alternatives evaluation in the FS as well as a strong preference that CSM information be “summarized ... in one place.” EPA (2005)

EPA provided additional redlines to the Contaminant Fate and Transport section of the FS on August 25 and requested that the LWG review these redlines and add in any additional discussion necessary. The LWG will provide these edits as soon as they are available.

2 – DELETION OF SEDIMENT/WATER BACKGROUND

EPA removed all descriptions of background conditions. Background conditions must be summarized in Section 1 to support the later FS discussion of primary remediation guidance concepts related to background. These guidance concepts include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) EPA typically does not set cleanup levels below background concentrations (EPA 2002a); and 2) Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) should reflect objectives that are achievable from the site cleanup (EPA 2005), and remediation below background is not an achievable objective. EPA guidance is also clear that establishing background conditions is vital to the CSM (EPA 1988, 2005).

EPA has indicated that sediment background (at least as a broad concept) will be used in preliminary remediation goal (PRG) selection for some contaminants of concern in Section 2 and in alternative evaluations in Section 4. The LWG has recently initiated formal dispute resolution with EPA concerning EPA’s selection of a single set of upriver sediment background values for the RI, which presumably EPA intends to carry forward into the FS for various purposes (e.g., PRG development, equilibrium assessment, alternatives development, and detailed evaluations of alternatives). For the reasons stated in the Request for Dispute Resolution submitted by the LWG on August 26, 2014, the values identified in Table 7.3-1b (and the related Appendix H Table H-2b) of the RI Section 7 revision agreed to by EPA and the LWG on December 12, 2013 should be the values carried forward into the FS. The FS must include some description of this concept to support these later uses of background. Similar to the CSM issue, to the extent that EPA intends to address background later in the FS, this approach will likely result in disjointed textual tangents on fundamental site-specific concepts.

Also, per LWG’s June 19, 2014 comments on Section 2, if EPA establishes surface water and TZW PRGs (which LWG believes is inappropriate for this Study Area), background values for surface water and TZW are needed so that cleanup levels are not set below background and are achievable per EPA guidance (EPA 2002a, 2005). In many cases, it is likely that the surface water and TZW PRGs EPA provided to the LWG will not be technically practicable to achieve due to ongoing upstream contributions, or groundwater sources that will not be addressed by the anticipated sediment remedy. EPA has indicated the Agency would consider technical impracticability during the post-remedy long-term monitoring phase. Again, this is inconsistent with the National Contingency Plan, which requires consideration of technical impracticability in remedy selection, as well as with guidance that states the RAOs and cleanup goals need to be achievable. 40 C.F.R. §300.430(f)(1)(ii)(C)(3); (EPA 2002a, 2005).

EPA indicated during the FS technical discussions that there were insufficient site data in surface water and TZW to develop background levels in these media. The LWG disagrees. There are

DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE

This document is currently under review by EPA and its federal, state, and tribal partners, and is subject to change in whole or in part.

sufficient site data to establish background for surface water, and literature data can be used to establish TZW background levels using methods detailed in our June 19, 2014 comments.

3 – SOURCE ISSUES

The summary of sources in the draft revised FS Section 1 is both factually inaccurate and much less clear as compared to the 2012 Draft FS.

Deletion of Source Control Inventory and Status – EPA removed the summary of the source control inventory and status information and any reference to the detailed inventory in Appendix Q that EPA previously directed the LWG to include in the Draft FS. As EPA noted in its November 23, 2010 letter to the LWG, the tables were intended to “provide a status of ongoing, or potentially ongoing, upland and overwater sources to Portland Harbor in order to support the potential recontamination assessment in the FS.” This is critical information for the Revised FS, and it was prepared consistent with the most recent Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Milestone Report for Upland Source Control available at the time.

EPA indicated during the informal discussions on Section 1 that its revised text was reviewed by the EPA lead on source control and by DEQ representatives and that the text is consistent with the upcoming Source Control Summary Report expected from DEQ in the fall of 2014, although this report is not referenced in EPA’s text. Because the report orally cited by EPA is not available, the draft text on sources is unverifiable by LWG (or anyone) at this time. Northwest Pipe’s August 22, 2014 letter demanding retraction of EPA’s text under implicit threat of legal action perfectly demonstrates why the LWG cannot agree to include statements about non-LWG PRPs in an LWG-authored document where those statements cannot be verified against any existing reference. The fact that EPA immediately deleted all reference to Northwest Pipe as a potential groundwater source on the basis of Northwest Pipe’s letter alone simply confirms EPA’s arbitrariness in selecting source information to include or exclude from the FS.

The source control inventory and status information should be restored to the revised FS. This information should then be updated as necessary relative to any source control progress on each site consistent with DEQ’s upcoming Source Control Summary Report, when that report is available. This information provides important context for the FS, and also supports EPA’s prior issuance of general notice letters for the site and future issuance of special notice letters. At a minimum, any issues related to source descriptions should be placed in the dispute “parking lot” as described in the June 11, 2014 Revision Process for the FS until DEQ’s document is available.

DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE

This document is currently under review by EPA and its federal, state, and tribal partners, and is subject to change in whole or in part.

Inclusion of New Upland Groundwater Plume and Riverbank Contamination Text – The LWG has three major concerns regarding this text. First, the information lacks clarity and accuracy because EPA does not cite the information sources upon which it relied, the relationship between potential upland sources and within Study Area conditions is not explained, and there are significant factual errors with regard to many of the upland sites discussed (as detailed in Attachment 1). EPA’s new text replaces the source control inventory information, which was clearly based on and consistent with the DEQ Milestone Report and the findings there regarding the potential for upland sources to impact the Study Area.

Second, EPA presents this new information in the Site Nature and Extent section, even though this information pertains to upland sources that will not be addressed through the in-water remedies evaluated in the FS. Most of the information appears irrelevant to actual conditions and potential sediment remediation within the Study Area boundary and is not linked to known data on Study Area conditions. For example, EPA removed the 2012 Draft FS text about Study Area TZW concentrations that provides the linkage between potential upland groundwater sources and actual Study Area conditions.

Third, on August 25 EPA indicated that bank erosion remedies up to the top of the bank will be included and evaluated in the FS. An important FS assumption is that sources, including bank erosion, will be controlled under the DEQ program at the time of the sediment remedy (EPA 2002b). EPA and DEQ have had a long-standing agreement to limit the lateral extent of the Study Area to an elevation of 13.3 North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88), and it is critical to maintain this boundary since the RI (including the CSM and risk assessments) was developed with that boundary in mind. *“Upland” versus “In-water” Definition and Portland Harbor Elevation Datums*, (DEQ, July 9, 2003). Therefore the 13.3 NAVD88 boundary should be retained and utilized in the FS, and upland source control actions and remedies should not be evaluated in the FS.

Deletion of Stormwater Sources – Although EPA’s new text in Section 1.2.3 extensively discusses groundwater and river bank sources, stormwater sources receive no similar discussion. There needs to be a balanced presentation of all sources in Section 1. Per the previous comments, this should be achieved by placing source information in a clearly marked source control subsection and using information from the Draft FS, with updates on source control status added where necessary.

4 – EARLY ACTION DATA

EPA’s draft Section 1 text indicates that early action data are included in the Revised FS. As noted in the LWG’s July 9, 2014 Draft LWG Responses to EPA’s Proposed Dredge Depth Approach, EPA’s plan for including early action datasets in various FS evaluations is currently unknown. For example, EPA’s Section 1 draft proposes to use RI figures that clearly do not include the early action data. The LWG is concerned that without a detailed data plan, it will be difficult to understand the following: 1) which evaluations are using the original FS database and which are using additional early action datasets; 2) whether differences in various evaluation

DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE

This document is currently under review by EPA and its federal, state, and tribal partners, and is subject to change in whole or in part.

conclusions in the Draft RI, Draft FS and Revised FS are the result of database differences versus technical issues.

On August 25, EPA requested that LWG prepare a new Section 1.3 that documents the FS sediment database and includes a modified Appendix R from the Draft FS that described the database rules. The LWG is working on this and will provide it to EPA when complete. This subsection will document the current contents of the FS database; however, the EPA current plan for data uses within the FS is not currently understood by LWG, and the issues raised above regarding the need for a detailed data plan still stand.

5 – INCOMPLETE RISK ASSESSMENT SUMMARIES

The risk assessment summaries in the current EPA draft lack context and, therefore, do not accurately convey risk assessment conclusions. Regarding human health, for example, there is no discussion of any exposure scenarios other than fish consumption, and more information is needed to help the reader understand the infant scenario. Regarding ecological risks, for example, the stand alone statements presented by EPA misrepresent risk conclusions without more explanation. The few points presented are not necessarily useful for making risk management decisions in the FS, and none of the important considerations behind the conclusions addressed in the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment uncertainty sections are discussed. Attachment 1 provides specific redline edits that address the LWG's concerns regarding this section.

REFERENCES

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 1988. Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA. Interim Final. EPA/540/G-89/004. OSWER Directive 9355.3-01. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2002a. Transmittal of Policy Statement: "Role of Background in the CERCLA Cleanup Program." From Michael B. Cook, Director of Office of Emergency and Remedial Response to Superfund National Policy Managers Regions 1 – 10. OSWER 9285.6-07P. May 1, 2002, Washington, D.C.

EPA. 2002b. Principles for Managing Contaminated Sediment Risks at Hazardous Waste Sites. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC. OSWER Directive 9285.6-08. February.

EPA, 2005. Contaminated Sediment Remediation Guidance for Hazardous Waste Sites. EPA 540-R-05-102. OSWER 9355.0-85. December 2005. Washington, D.C.

DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE

This document is currently under review by EPA and its federal, state, and tribal partners, and is subject to change in whole or in part.